

REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 9 April 2001 with twenty-three claims, two of which were written in independent form. No claims have been allowed. Claims 1, 2, 11, and 18 have been amended, and Claims 20-23 canceled herein without prejudice.

Claims 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for using the phrase "Java-like." Claim 2 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,324,694 to Butler *et al.* ("Butler").

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, "receiving a terrestrial broadcast signal comprising a video stream" and "receiving said Internet-based content via satellite transmission and sending transmitting information via landline transmission." The applicant respectfully submits Butler does not appear to show, teach, or suggest these limitations in combination with the additional limitations recited by Claim 1.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0117831 to Ellis *et al.*

Claim 11 has been amended to recite, "said embedding comprising embedding commands in said video stream to prompt access to Internet sites offering pushed products selected using analysis of said viewer's habits." The applicant respectfully submits Ellis does not appear to show, teach, or suggest this limitation in combination with the additional limitations recited by Claim 11.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Butler.

Claim 18 has been amended to recite, "a broadcast video receiver for receiving video data from a video provider service via terrestrial broadcast transmission; an internet browser providing bi-directional access to internet content, said internet browser receiving said internet content via satellite transmission, and said internet browser sending said internet content via landline transmission." The applicant respectfully submits Butler does not appear to show, teach, or suggest these limitations in combination with the additional limitations recited by Claim 18.

Claims 2, 4, 9, 12, 14, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Butler. Claims 3, 5-8, 10, 13, 15-17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being

anticipated by Ellis.

Claims 2-10, 12-17, and 19 depend from Claims 1 and 18 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons stated above with respect to Claims 1 and 18, Butler and Ellis do not appear to show, teach, or suggest the limitations of the independent claims, much less the limitations of the independent claims in combination with the additional limitations of the dependent claims.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-4379
FAX: (972) 917-4418